

**HANFORD REACH NATIONAL MONUMENT
FEDERAL PLANNING ADVISORY COMMITTEE**

**Final Meeting Summary: Session # 7
Wednesday, May 29, 2002
City of West Richland Council Chambers
West Richland, WA**

The Hanford Reach National Monument Federal Planning Advisory Committee met on Thursday, May 29, 2002 from 12:00 p.m. to 4:00 p.m. in the City of West Richland Council Chambers, West Richland, Washington.

The purpose of the meeting was to:

1. Prepare advice to US Fish and Wildlife Service on issues statements for the Issues, Concerns and Opportunities Workbooks, and
2. Discuss strategies for public outreach to engage and educate the public during the scoping process.

Welcome and Introductions

Greg Hughes, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) Designated Federal Official (DFO) and Project Leader, Hanford Reach National Monument, opened the meeting and welcomed Committee members, the public, and other attendees. Mr. Hughes turned the meeting over to the Committee Chair, Jim Watts.

Jim Watts reviewed the public comment process and reminded those that would like to make public comment that there was a five-minute time limit. A public comment sheet is available at the sign in table for those interested in giving comment. He also reviewed the Committee's purpose and charter.

Alice Shorett, facilitator, reviewed the day's agenda, noting that the purpose of the day's session was to provide USFWS with Committee advice on the Issues, Concerns and Opportunities Workbooks for use in scoping issues around a Comprehensive Conservation Plan (CCP) for the National Monument. In another part of the agenda, the USFWS would present to the Committee strategies for public outreach for the scoping process. She also reviewed the material in the Committee's packets, including the subcommittee reports to be discussed in the meeting.

Greg Hughes discussed the USFWS government-to-government consultation process with tribal governments. He explained it was an ongoing process and that he had sent out letters to all tribal governments seeking input from them on how they would like to proceed. He had received a response from the Nez Perce Tribe and he would be meeting with representatives from the Yakama Indian Nation at the end of the week. He added that the consultation process would

occur early and be ongoing throughout the planning process.

Additionally, Mr. Hughes indicated that the Notice Of Intent to start the public scoping process had cleared the Secretary of Interior's office and is expected to be published within the next few weeks.

Jim Watts explained that the Committee had not heard from tribal governments regarding valid existing rights related to the National Monument. Mr. Watts suggested the Committee hold a meeting during August and invite the tribal governments to brief the Committee for that purpose. Members of the Committee agreed and Mr. Watts requested the facilitation team contact tribal governments and organize an August meeting as an all day, full Committee meeting.

Action: Triangle will coordinate with the tribal governments and organize an August meeting to hear from the Treaty Tribes about their Valid Existing Rights in the National Monument.

Meeting Summaries from Session # 5 and Working Session #6

The draft meeting summary from Session #5 was approved. There was a discussion regarding the summary for Working Session #6 and a number of revisions were suggested. The Committee approved Working Session #6 summary, as amended.

Action: The meeting summary from Session #5 was approved. The summary from Working Session #6 was approved with changes.

Review of draft advice package on Issues Statement for Public Scoping and Committee

Action

Jim Watts reviewed the process for the afternoon; first, to hear from each of the subcommittee chairs on their respective subcommittee reports, including any changes they had made from their initial reports as presented at the Working Session on May 2nd; second, to hear discussion about the report; and third, to adopt the subcommittee report as part of the Committee's advice to the USFWS.

Valid Existing Rights Subcommittee Report

Bob Thompson, subcommittee chair, reported to the full Committee that it was the intent of the subcommittee to provide a framework for discussion on all of the current valid existing rights. The subcommittee expects that the public scoping process will increase the breadth and depth of the report offered to the Committee today.

The Committee continued discussion on the need for identifying all the valid existing rights and the necessity to clarify all of the existing rights, and differentiating between those rights and other responsibilities or authorities.

Jim Watts reiterated that the purpose of the Committee's first product was to present an initial set of issues to be taken out to the public through the scoping process. It was suggested that an issues statement brought to the Committee meeting by Energy Northwest be entered into the public scoping process, by Energy Northwest.

Greg Hughes agreed that this is a starting point that will be addressed further throughout the public scoping process. It was moved, seconded and passed unanimously to adopt, as full Committee advice, the Subcommittee Report on Valid Existing Rights.

Action: The Committee adopted the Valid Existing Rights Issues Report to be included in its advice to the USFWS. (Attachment A)

Resource Protection Subcommittee Report

Rick Leamont, subcommittee chair, reviewed the subcommittee work. The subcommittee divided the issues into specific resources and how certain management actions would impact resources. They focused on the protection of the resources recognizing that there was another subcommittee addressing the issues and opportunities surrounding public use and access.

During full Committee discussion of the subcommittee report, there was dialogue about the difference between protecting the Monument resources for public use versus protecting the Monument resources for research and education. The Committee tried to differentiate between the distinction of protecting the Monument and using it for recreation versus using it for research or education. It was noted that these issues will be discussed through scoping.

During the Committee discussion, two sub-headings in the report were amended -- (1) Revise page 1 subheading from "Protection of the Monument for Purposes of Research and Education" to "Protection of the Monument for and through Research and Education," (2) Revise page 2 subheading, second bullet, from "Protection of Native Plants and Insects" to "Protection of Native Biota." An amendment on monitoring was made, as a new bullet on page 2, to read: "**Resource Monitoring:** *A comprehensive monitoring program should be instituted to provide early detection, a timely adaptive management response and mitigation of impacts to the resources.*" It was moved, seconded and passed unanimously to adopt the Subcommittee Report on Resource Protection.

Action: The Committee adopted the Resource Protection Issues Report to be included in its advice to the USFWS, with amendments. (Attachment B)

Public Use and Access Subcommittee Report

Rich Steele, subcommittee chair, explained the subcommittee process to produce their report.

They presented some history of use and access. The subcommittee issues statement presents some potential uses and access, and identifies those potential uses or access under three geographic areas on the Monument: Arid Lands Ecology Reserve (ALE), Wahluke Slope and the Columbia River corridor. It was noted that the subcommittee members do not think “one size fits all,” and uses that might be appropriate in one geographic area may be completely inappropriate in another area. Therefore, the subcommittee approached public uses and access in geographic areas.

The Committee entered into a discussion of the subcommittee report. That discussion focused on the issues and opportunities not specifically identified in the initial report. Again, it was confirmed that the public scoping process would help specifically identify those uses and access not identified in the report.

An amendment was made to add “Ultralites” to the Recreational Uses section. It was moved, seconded and adopted unanimously to approve the Subcommittee Report on Public Use and Access, as amended, as part of the Committee’s advice.

Action: The Committee adopted the Public Use and Access Issues Report to be included in its advice to the USFWS, with one amendment. (Attachment C)

Ad Hoc Subcommittee Report

Leo Bowman, subcommittee chair, explained the subcommittee would address the issue of sloughing of the White Bluffs. The consultant (Triangle) would write a letter to the list of entities involved in the White Bluffs sloughing in order to bring all the information together. The purpose is to determine what advice could be given to the USFWS, USDOE and the US Department of the Interior on the process needed to address sloughing of the White Bluffs.

Action: Triangle will send out to the Committee a list of potential people to be interviewed on the White Bluffs sloughing issue.

Public Participation Strategies Presentation and Discussion

Jim Watts introduced Susan Saul, Public Outreach Specialist of the USFWS Pacific Northwest Region. She explained her background in the public participation process through public scoping. The purpose of her presentation was to review the outreach planning process, get some advice from the Committee on specific public participation, and ideas the USFWS could use in scoping the issues for the CCP. Ms. Saul’s presentation is included as Attachment D.

Ms. Saul described some tools to consider for scoping. She mentioned some specific passive public information techniques, which include printed public information materials, press releases

and a web site. Some examples of active public participation techniques include briefings, central information contact, field trips, open houses, and a Field Office. Examples of public input techniques include small meetings, response sheets, large format public meetings, and workshops.

She asked the Committee to engage in a discussion on what they perceive as their role in the public scoping process. Some Committee members suggested that they should be involved in the public scoping sessions and their role should be described from the beginning to help educate and engage the public. The Committee should be available to interact with the public throughout the process. Committee members expressed their desire to be recognized at public scoping sessions where they hope to listen to ideas raised by the communities and interested public.

The Committee provided ideas for public involvement methods to be used in scoping, including: (1) an updated web site that includes all materials from meetings; (2) facilitated workshops or focus groups; (3) briefings to clubs, Rotaries and other organizational gatherings; (4) material package that goes out to the public defining the objectives; (5) well-defined purpose: *why* going out to the public and *who* is the audience; (6) reach a wide geographical area that is reflected in the outreach (i.e. TVW - statewide broadcast); (7) be collaborative in approach with the USFWS, (8) should be an open process with public sessions (face-to-face is important); (9) four to six intensive regional meetings in the five county region of Grant, Walla Walla, Benton, Franklin, and Yakima; (10) extensive education about the National Monument and the CCP planning process needs to take place; (11) start with an Open House at the Refuge office in Richland; (12) look at the National Park Service's Wild and Scenic Rivers report to see who attended those sessions; and (13) take advantage of meetings already on-going (i.e. FACA Committee and other existing organizations) for information dissemination and gathering.

Protocol on Committee Presentations / Information

Alice Shorett presented to the Committee the suggested protocol for the flow of information to the Committee (Attachment E). There were no changes to the information as presented. Any future additions to the suggested protocol would be forwarded to Triangle.

Action: The Committee will use the suggested protocol as rationale for receiving information. (Attachment E)

Discussion on B Reactor Final Configuration (DOE Letter # 02-ERD-0060, April 19, 2002)

Jim Watts discussed the above-referenced letter from the Department of Energy on cocooning the B Reactor. He proposed that the Committee present a friendly letter to the DOE regarding the preservation of the B Reactor. The Committee further discussed the need of supporting the preservation of the B Reactor through a letter, and getting that on the record. In discussion about this topic, it was noted that Committee members need to have information regarding alternatives for the B Reactor, and implications for including it within the National Monument boundary.

Following research and information on these topics, the Committee could take action. It was suggested that one option is for the Committee to provide advice to the USFWS and DOE that the B Reactor be included within the planning environment of the CCP for the National Monument.

It was moved, seconded, and passed unanimously that the Committee requests the Chair to draft a letter to the USFWS and DOE stating that the Committee takes the position that the CCP planning environment for the Hanford Reach National Monument should include the B Reactor and other historic sites adjacent to the Monument, and to notify appropriate authorities.

Action: The Committee Chair will compose a letter to take the position that the CCP planning environment for the Hanford Reach National Monument should include the B Reactor and other adjacent historic sites, and to notify appropriate authorities.

Recap and Next Steps

Alice Shorett described the summer schedule, including the planned inventory tours. She explained that the August meeting to hear the valid existing rights would take place in one place with all five tribes presenting information to the Committee on their valid existing rights. The meeting date would be confirmed after consultation with the Tribes. She also suggested the future meeting dates:

- Monday and Tuesday, September 9th and 10th
- Wednesday, October 16th
- Tuesday, November 19th

Greg Hughes presented to the Committee some topics of daily Monument management. The brochure is almost complete and would be available for public this summer. A briefing for the US Department of the Interior officials, and others in Washington D.C. is being prepared for some time during the summer. Filling vacancies on the Committee has been addressed in a letter to the Secretary of the Interior. Fire management is moving forward, and the plan to address future fire needs had been executed. Congressman Hastings had a briefing meeting with the Director of the USFWS and Mr. Hughes responded to questions raised in that briefing.

Public Comment

Eugene Van Liew of the Richland Rod and Gun Club addressed the Committee. He had heard a rumor about the possibility of a plan of reducing 80 acres by the Vernita Boat Launch down to 5 acres of usable land, due to the transfer of land back to the Tribes. He indicated the land in question was on the north side of the river, in Grant County. His question to the USFWS or others on the Committee was to explain if this rumor was true, and if so could they add more detail to the plan.

Jeff Tayer, Regional Director of the Washington State Department of Fish and Wildlife

(WDFW) responded by saying that WDFW is responsible for the management of the lands currently, through an interagency agreement and that the land is owned by DOE, and, though within the National Monument boundary, has not yet been transferred to the USFWS. He added that he had no knowledge of a plan to change the management of those lands from current practice, and that he had no knowledge of reduction of the size of the land in question.

Greg Hughes adjourned the meeting at 4:05 p.m.

Certified By:

Greg Hughes
Designated Federal Official

Jim Watts
Chair

WORKING SESSION ATTENDANCE

Committee Seat	Member	Alternate
K-12 Education	Karen Weida	Royace Aikin
Cities	Bob Thompson	<i>vacant</i>
Conservation/Environmental	Rick Leaumont	Mike Lilga
Counties	Leo Bowman	Frank Brock
Economic Development	Jim Watts	Harold Heacock
Outdoor Recreation	Rich Steele	Mike Wiemers
Public-at-Large	Kris Watkins	
Scientific/Academic	Michele Gerber	
	David Geist	Dennis Dauble
	Gene Schreckhise	
State	Jeff Tayer	Ron Skinnarland
Tribal	Rex Buck	<i>vacant</i>
Utilities/Irrigation	Nancy Craig	<i>vacant</i>
Designated Federal Official	Greg Hughes	

Participants and Invited Speakers

U.S. Department of Energy	Bob Rosselli, Deputy Manager for Business Services
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service	Susan Saul

Facilitators

Triangle Associates, Inc.	Alice Shorett	Derek Van Marter
---------------------------	---------------	------------------

Meeting Support

U.S. Department of Energy	Peggy Terlson
---------------------------	---------------

Observers

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service	Paula Call
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service	Charles Houghten
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service	Glenn Frederick
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service	Mike Marxen
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service	Jenna Gaston
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service	Heidi Brunkal
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service	David Smith
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (McNary)	Naomi Sherer
U.S. Department of Energy	Dana Ward
U.S. Department of Energy	Tom Ferns
Nez Perce Tribe	Patrick Sabotta
	Dan Landeen

*Hanford Reach National Monument
Federal Planning Advisory Committee
Meeting Summary*

Final
May 29, 2002

Benton County
Benton County Park Board
BPA
RR & G
Energy Northwest
Back Country Horsemen
Purple Sage Riders
WA Water Trails
Columbia Riverkeeper
Richland Rod & Gun

Congressman Hastings Office

Tri-City Herald
Public

Adam Fyall
Donna Raines
Mary Hollen
Gaylord Pyle
John Arbuckle
Linda Smith
Everyll Davison
Reed Waite
Laurence Cotton
Eddie Manthos
Eugene Van Liew
Joyce Olson
Tyler Prout
Mike Lee
Alan Stellwagen
Matt Taylor
Marve Hyman

DISTRIBUTED MATERIALS

Committee's Packet of Materials

Meeting Agenda (May 29, 2002)
Draft Meeting Summary: Session #5 (March 19, 2002)
Draft Working Session Summary: Session #6 (May 2, 2002)
Letter from Keith Klein, DOE-RL
Hanford Land Transfer, Chapters 5-6
IAP2 Public Participation Spectrum
IAP2 Public Participation Toolbox
ALE Public Outreach Plan
Advice Flow Process
HRNMFPAC Summer 2002 Schedule
Valid Existing Rights subcommittee report
Resource Protection subcommittee report
Public Use and Access subcommittee report

Materials Handed Out at Meeting

Discussion Paper from Energy Northwest (John Arbuckle)